STATEMENT OF
HONORABLE GORDON ENGLAND
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
BEFORE THE
BRAC COMMISSON
17 MAY 2005

Introduction

This is an overview of the Department of the Navy's Report to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, provided as a roadmap with which to review the report. The report constitutes our response to the requirements of the Base Closure Act for the 2005 round of base realignment and closure (BRAC 2005). The Department of the Navy employed a multi-pronged strategy for BRAC 2005 that sought to rationalize and consolidate infrastructure capabilities to eliminate unnecessary excess; balance the effectiveness of Fleet concentrations with anti-terrorism / force protection desires for dispersion of assets and redundancy of facilities; leverage opportunities for total force laydown and joint basing; accommodate changing operational concepts; and facilitate the evolution of force structure and infrastructure organizational alignment.

In developing BRAC 2005 recommendations, the Department of the Navy (DON) adhered to the principles that the recommendations must eliminate excess capacity, save money, improve operational readiness and jointness, and maintain quality of service. Developing recommendations in BRAC 2005 was challenging given that the recommendations must be based on a 20-year Force Structure Plan, a much longer range view than has been done before. This requirement to fully consider the future and its inherent uncertainties resulted in retaining more infrastructure than analysis supported, in order to ensure we do not eliminate anything we thought we might need in the future.

General comments about the BRAC process

The purpose of the Base Closure Act is to provide a fair process that will result in the timely closure and realignment of military installations inside the United States.

- Statutorily mandated process
- Recommendations objectively based on selection criteria
- 20-year Force Structure Plan focus

The BRAC 2005 proposal is the most comprehensive approach to BRAC thus far.

Like all previous BRAC rounds, elimination of excess physical capacity is one of the objectives for BRAC 2005.

BRAC 2005 also serves to rationalize infrastructure with defense strategy.

BRAC 2005 is the means for reconfiguring the current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes war-fighting capability and efficiency.

A focus is to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity. Therefore, BRAC 2005 analysis was divided in two pieces:

- Joint Cross-Service Groups analyzed common business-oriented functions
- Military Departments analyzed all Service unique functions.

Department of Navy Report

The Department of the Navy report describes the Department of the Navy process to analyze Service unique functions, the analyses from which its recommendations were derived, and the considerations that led to particular decisions.

Department of the Navy Process and Methodology

The Department of the Navy built its process and methodology to support its BRAC 2005 strategy.

- Scrupulously followed the process laid out in the Base Closure Act
- Conducted a fair and unbiased analysis of each installation
- Based on future force structure requirements and certified data
- Most in-depth and inclusive BRAC process ever utilized by the Department of the Navy

Legal Requirements

- All installations were considered equally
- Only certified data was used in our analysis
- Recommendations were based on the 20-year Force Structure Plan
- Recommendations were based on the legally mandated selection criteria

Leadership and Organizations

To satisfy the responsibility for making sound and timely base closure and realignment recommendations to the Secretary of Defense that were in compliance with the Base Closure Act and Department of Defense (DoD) guidance, the Department of the Navy established several BRAC organizations:

- Infrastructure Evaluation Group
    - Nine members
    - Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, and the Special Assistant for BRAC were designated as Co-Chairs
    - Members had experience in logistics, planning, requirements, and / or operations
    - Developed closure and realignment recommendations for approval by the Secretary of the Navy
    - Ensured concerns of operational commanders were considered in any recommendations

- Department of the Navy (DON) Analysis Group
    - Eleven members
    - Special Assistant for BRAC was designated as Chair

- Conducted analyses of Department of the Navy unique functions and developed closure and realignment recommendations for consideration by the Infrastructure Evaluation Group
- Ensured concerns of operational commanders were considered in any recommendations

- Functional Advisory Board
  - Membership consisted of Navy and Marine Corps principal members of the seven Joint Cross-Service Groups
  - Ensured Department of the Navy leadership was thoroughly briefed and prepared on Joint Cross-Service Group matters
  - Coordinated with the Infrastructure Evaluation Group to ensure that the Department of the Navy position on common business-oriented support functions was clearly articulated and understood
  - Established to ensure the Navy and Marine Corps vision of the future, based on the 20-year Force Structure Plan, was clearly articulated, understood, and supported throughout the BRAC 2005 Joint Cross-Service Group process

- Infrastructure Analysis Team
  - Provided staff support to the Infrastructure Evaluation Group and DON Analysis Group
  - Composed of military and civilian analysts and supporting staff from throughout the Department of the Navy and from the Center for Naval Analysis
  - Team members represented a broad spectrum of expertise and capability, with emphasis on senior officers with operational experience

Scope of Effort

The first step in the process was to categorize and aggregate activities for analysis. For BRAC 2005, the Secretary of Defense directed that the analysis would be divided into two categories of functions with seven Joint Cross-Service Groups analyzing common business-oriented support functions and the Military Departments analyzing all Service unique functions.

- Department of the Navy Unique Functions
  - Operations (Surface / Subsurface Operations, Aviation Operations, Ground Operations, and Munitions Storage and Distribution)
  - Education and Training (Recruit Training, Officer Accessions Training, and Department of the Navy Unique Professional Military Education)
  - Headquarters and Support (Reserve Centers, Recruiting Districts / Stations, and Regional Support Activities)
  - Other Support (Organizational Followers, Dependent Activities, Stand Alone Activities, and Specialized Functions Activities).

- 889 activities in the Navy and Marine Corps Universe
  - 469 analyzed by one or more of the Joint Cross-Service Groups
  - 590 analyzed by the Department of the Navy
  - Some activities analyzed by Department of the Navy and one or more Joint Cross-Service Groups
  - Every activity fell under the analytic purview of either the Department of the Navy or a Joint Cross-Service Group
  - Totality of activities analyzed covered the universe of Department of the Navy bases.

Data Collection

The next step in the BRAC 2005 process was the development of requests for information, or data calls, for the purpose of collecting all types of information required for development of the base structure database and use in subsequent analyses.

- Data calls went to DON activity level
- Joint Cross-Service Groups and Military Departments developed joint capacity data call that was sent to all Department of the Navy activities
- Supplemental capacity data calls were issued to targeted Department of the Navy activities
- A second series of data calls was issued to targeted activities to obtain information necessary for military value and other selection criteria analyses
- Most Department of the Navy activities received multiple data calls
- Additional data calls were issued during the scenario analysis phase
- Department of the Navy BRAC Information Transfer System (DONBITS) was used for the distribution of data calls and collection of activity responses and supporting documentation

DONBITS, a secure web-based data collection and management tool, was the sole and authoritative base structure database.

- Served as the baseline for evaluation of all Department of the Navy installations
- Only certified data could be entered into DONBITS
- Data was certified as accurate and complete by the officer or civilian employee who initially generated data in response to a request for information, and then at each succeeding level in an established certification chain

Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis compared the current Department of the Navy base structure to the future force structure requirements to determine whether excess base structure capacity existed within a given functional area.

- Capacity analysis was conducted on a functional basis (e.g., ship berthing) rather than by installation category (e.g., Naval Stations)

- Measures of capacity were selected which reflected the appropriate "metric" for that function
- If total current capacity in a function was greater than the capacity required to support the future force structure, excess capacity was deemed to exist

Military Value Analysis

Except for a limited number of activities, each activity performing a given function was subjected to a military value analysis.

- Used a quantitative methodology that was as objective as possible
- Foundation of the analysis was the military value selection criteria
- Assessed relative military value of activities performing a given function
- Enabled comparison of one activity within a function against another in that function

Configuration Analysis

The purpose of configuration analysis was to identify for each function that set of activities that best meets the needs of the Navy and Marine Corps in light of future requirements, while eliminating the most excess capacity.

- Configuration analysis used a mixed-integer linear programming solver
- Generated multiple solutions for an optimization model
- Allowed DON Analysis Group to explore tradeoffs between eliminating excess capacity and retaining sites having high military value

Scenario Development

The configuration analysis solutions were used by the DON Analysis Group as the starting point for the development of potential closure and realignment scenarios that would undergo analysis to determine return on investment.

- Iterative process in which results of the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) analyses and inputs from senior Defense leadership were used to generate additional options
- The Fleet, major claimants (including the System Commands), and the Department of the Navy civilian leadership played integral part of scenario development
- The DON Analysis Group/Infrastructure Evaluation Group developed and analyzed 187 scenarios involving 344 activities

Scenario Analysis

COBRA analyses were conducted on all of these scenarios, using certified responses to scenario data calls from affected installations and their tenants.

- COBRA used as a tool to ensure that Department of the Navy recommendations were cost effective
- DON Analysis Group aggressively challenged cost estimates to ensure both their consistency and reasonableness
- DON Analysis Group ensured that out year requirements were appropriately reduced in terms of personnel, facilities, and capacities of remaining facilities
- DON Analysis Group and the Infrastructure Evaluation Group sensitive to up-front costs and the length of time required to obtain a return on investment
- Significant majority of the Department of the Navy recommendations will obtain a return on investment within four years, with savings offsetting costs of closure within the closure implementation period

Economic impact on the local economic area for each Department of the Navy installation considered for closure or realignment was assessed during the scenario analysis process

- Economic Impact Tool provided a uniform methodology for estimating the total direct and indirect job changes associated with a closure or realignment scenario
- Department of the Navy made every effort to fully understand the economic impacts its recommendations might have on local communities

The Department of the Navy also considered the ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel

- Reviewed ten community attributes: demographics, child care, cost of living, education, employment, housing, medical providers, safety / crime, transportation, and utilities
- No significant community infrastructure impacts were identified for any of the Department of the Navy proposed closure or realignment actions

Environmental impacts of different closure and realignment scenarios were also considered

- Reviewed ten environmental resource areas: air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands
- Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts provided an overview of the certified data, including the costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities, and summarized the environmental impacts associated with a particular scenario
- Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts was prepared for each gaining installation
- Environmental impact analysis permitted the Department of the Navy to obtain a comprehensive picture of the potential environmental impacts arising from the recommendations for closure and realignment

- No environmental impacts that would preclude implementation were identified for any scenario

The DON Analysis Group and the Infrastructure Evaluation Group utilized two assessment tools at two different points during the scenario development and analysis process to frame their deliberative discussions.

- Alignment Assessment graphically portrayed how well a scenario aligned with the Department's BRAC strategy and compared it against the military value for the activity being evaluated, allowing the deliberative bodies to discuss whether a scenario was consistent with the capacity and military value analyses prior to issuance of a scenario data call
- Candidate Recommendation Risk Assessment provided a mechanism for the DON Analysis Group and the Infrastructure Evaluation Group to logically discuss Selection Criteria 5 through 8 analyses to assess warfighting / readiness risks, to compare alternative recommendations, and to assess whether the recommendations should be forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy for consideration

Results

Build upon the substantial reductions in infrastructure resulting from prior rounds of BRAC and the organizational changes made in the years since BRAC 1995.

Will allow us to better afford the capital investments and modernization required in the future.

Recommendations both reduce excess capacity and balance force and base structure in a way that will foster operational flexibility, synergistic readiness support, and joint opportunities wherever possible.

The proposals in BRAC 2005 balance base structure to support future force structure in the following ways:

Operational Bases

- Maintain sufficient flexibility to meet future military commitments while effectively utilizing existing capacity
- Recommendations result in retention of capacity to house more ships and aircraft squadrons than will exist in our future force structure in order to retain the capability to adjust to operational tempo changes and to achieve the desired strategic laydown and presence
- Our analysis led to the determination that there is no significant excess capacity in Department of the Navy ground force bases, particularly given the planned increase in Marine Corps force structure
- Recommendations maintain Fleet dispersal and viable anti-terrorism/force protection capability while simultaneously supporting optimal power projection, rapid force deployment and expeditionary force reach-back

Close Submarine Base New London, Connecticut. Relocate its assigned submarines, Auxiliary Repair Dock and Nuclear Research Submarine to Submarine Base Kings Bay, Georgia and Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia. Relocate the intermediate submarine repair function to Shore Intermediate Repair Activity Norfolk, at Naval Shipyard Norfolk, Virginia and Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay, Georgia. (Refer to page A-7 of the DON Report).

- Existing berthing capacity at surface / subsurface installations exceeds the capacity required to support Force Structure Plan
- Closure reduces excess capacity while increasing the average military value of the remaining bases
- Sufficient capacity and fleet dispersal is maintained with the East Coast submarine fleet homeports of Naval Station Norfolk and Submarine Base Kings Bay
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $679.64 million with net present value (NPV) savings to the Department over 20 years of $1.58 billion

Close Naval Station Pascagoula, Mississippi. Relocate its ships to Naval Station Mayport, Florida. Relocate the ship intermediate repair facility to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Mayport, Florida. (Refer to page A-9 of the DON Report).

- Reduce excess berthing capacity while allowing for consolidation of surface ships in a fleet concentration area
- Sufficient capacity and fleet dispersal is maintained with East Coast surface fleet homeports of Naval Station Norfolk and Naval Station Mayport
- Gulf Coast presence can be achieved as needed with available Navy ports at Naval Air Station Key West, Florida and Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida
- Guided Missile Cruisers (CG-47 Class) at Naval Station Pascagoula scheduled for decommissioning prior to FY 2006 will not relocate
- Total estimated one-time cost to this recommendation is $17.94 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $665.69 million

Close Naval Station Ingleside, Texas. Relocate its ships to Naval Station San Diego, California. Relocate ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity San Diego. Consolidate Mine Warfare Training Center Justification with Fleet Anti-submarine Warfare Training Center, San Diego, California. Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas. Relocate Commander Mine Warfare Command and Commander Mobile Mine Assembly Group to Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Center, Point Loma, California. Relocate Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron (HM-15) to Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia. (Refer to page A-11 of the DON Report).

- Moves mine warfare surface and aviation assets to major fleet concentration areas and reduces excess capacity
- Gulf Coast presence can be achieved as needed with available Navy ports at Naval Station Key West, Florida and Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida
- Minehunter Coastal ships at Naval Station Ingleside are scheduled for decommissioning between FY 2006 and FY 2007 and will not relocate

- US Coast Guard presence is expected to remain in the Gulf Coast region
- Creates a center of excellence for Undersea Warfare in San Diego area
- Single sites all Mine Warfare aircraft in a Fleet Concentration Area
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $178.39 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $822.23 million

Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, Georgia. Relocate its aircraft to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, Louisiana; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, Texas; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, Georgia. (Refer to page C-9 of the DON Report).

- Reduces excess capacity while maintaining reserve forces in regions with favorable demographics
- Aviation assets will be located closer to theater of operations and / or will result in increased maintenance efficiencies and operational synergies
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $43.03 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $910.87 million

Realign Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine to a Naval Air Facility and relocate its aircraft to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida. Consolidate Aviation Intermediate Maintenance with Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Jacksonville, Florida. (Refer to page C-11 of the DON Report).

- Reduces operation costs while single siting the East Coast Maritime Patrol community at Naval Air Station Jacksonville
- Retains an operational airfield in the northeast to support the homeland defense mission, as needed, and maintains strategic flexibility.
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $147.16 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $238.77 million

Close Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, Pennsylvania. Relocate all Navy and Marine Corps squadrons to McGuire Air Force Base, Cookstown, New Jersey. Realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, Pennsylvania, by relocating Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 775 Detachment A to McGuire Air Force base. (Refer to page C-13 of the DON Report).

- Reduces excess capacity while creating new joint opportunities in the McGuire Air Force Base / Fort Dix / Naval Aviation Engineering Station Lakehurst military concentration area
- Leverages maintenance and operational efficiencies within Marine Corps Reserve Aviation and maintains reserve forces in areas with favorable demographics
- Realignment of Cambria Regional Airport allows the assets currently housed there to be collocated with a Major Marine Reserve Aviation Headquarters at McGuire Air Force Base
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $125.25 million with NPV and savings to the Department over 20 years of $714.97 million

Close the Inland area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, California. The Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord, along with the retained portion of the Inland area, will be transferred to the Army. (Refer to page D-7 of the DON Report).

- Department of the Navy weapons stations have no excess capacity for loading and distribution of munitions
- Department of the Navy weapons stations have excess munitions storage capacity.
- Inland magazine field has been in a reduced operating status since 1999
- Inland area is excess to Department of the Navy / DoD needs and is severable
- Closure of the Inland area will save money and have no impact on mission capability
- City of Concord requested closure of both the Inland and Tidal portions of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord
- Transfer of the property to the Army aligns with property holder with the property user
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $13.95 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $199.72 million

Education and Training activities

- Recommendations retain capacity and flexibility to meet current and future force structure and surge requirements
- Department of the Navy–unique professional military education activities were determined to be properly sized and sited to support their target populations
- Retention of two Marine recruit training depots is considered necessary to maintain flexibility sufficient to accommodate surge and increased operational tempo
- Prior rounds of BRAC concentrated on the consolidation of Navy recruit training. BRAC 2005 sought to extend that consolidation effort to Navy officer accession training

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida by relocating Officer Training Command Pensacola, Florida to Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island and consolidating with Officer Training Command Newport, Rhode Island. (Refer to page E-13 of the DON Report).

- Consolidation of Officer Training Commands at Officer Training Command Newport will reduce inefficiencies inherent in maintaining two sites for similar training
- Supports the Department of the Navy initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $3.5 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $10.0 million

Reserve activities

- Overriding objective was to maintain a demographically sound Reserve establishment while providing balanced recruiting opportunities
- Sought to consolidate reserve units to active-duty or joint Service Centers where they could more effectively support the Fleet without impacting recruiting demographics
- Facilitate the downsizing of the Department of the Navy Reserve infrastructure by consolidating Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers while maintaining a geographically appropriate structure

Close Navy Reserve Centers in Tuscaloosa, Alabama; St Petersburg, Florida; Pocatello, Idaho; Forest Park, Illinois; Evansville, Indiana; Cedar Rapids and Sioux City, Iowa; Lexington, Kentucky; Bangor, Maine; Adelphi, Maryland; Duluth, Minnesota; Cape Girardeau, Missouri; Lincoln, Nebraska; Glens Falls, Horseheads and Watertown, New York; Asheville, North Carolina; Central Point, Oregon; and in Lubbock and Orange, Texas. Also, close the Navy Reserve Facility in Marquette, Michigan and the Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers in Grissom Air Reserve Base, Peru, Indiana and Tacoma, Washington. (Refer to page F-7 of the DON Report).

- Reduces excess capacity through the consolidation of 23 Navy Reserve Centers / Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers with other reserve centers in the effected areas
- Reserve centers will close and their drilling population supported by other existing centers thereby reducing management overhead
- Sufficient capacity for drilling reserves is maintained throughout the United States, and all states will continue to have at least one Navy Reserve Center / Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $1.97 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $236.51 million

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers in Encino and Los Angeles, California; Moundsville, West Virginia; Reading, Pennsylvania; Akron and Cleveland, Ohio; Madison and Lacrosse Wisconsin; Dubuque, Iowa; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Tulsa, Oklahoma; and Mobile, Alabama. Close Inspector-Instructor Rome, Georgia and Inspector-Instructor West Trenton, New Jersey. (Refer to page F-15 of the DON Report).

- Reduces excess capacity through the consolidation of 12 Navy Reserve Centers and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers with other reserve centers in the effected areas or into Armed Forces Reserve Centers
- Relocates two Inspector-Instructor activities to existing reserve facilities aboard active duty bases
- Sufficient capacity for drilling reserves is maintained throughout the United States, and all states will continue to have at lest one Navy / Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $62.39 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $76.87 million

Recruiting

- Focused on the elimination of excess management capacity and reduction of lease costs
- Maintains sufficient recruiting management oversight to support Department of the Navy accession requirements

Close Navy Recruiting Districts in Montgomery, Alabama; Indianapolis, Indiana; Kansas City, Missouri; Omaha, Nebraska; and Buffalo, New York. (Refer to page G-7 of the DON Report).

- Achieves economies of scale and scope by reducing excess capacity in management overhead and physical resources in the Navy Recruiting District functional area
- Recommendation is consistent with the Commander, Navy Recruiting Command's Transformation Plan, which envisions consolidation of active and reserve recruiting functions and supports the reallocation of management oversight over all Navy recruiting functions
- Does not impact the storefront recruiting offices currently assigned to the closing Navy Recruiting Districts
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $2.44 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $214.5 million

Regionalized support structure

- Recommendations continue the move toward a regionalized support structure
- Reducing the number of Installation Management Regions
- Aligns other service commands to those Regions saving costs relating to facilities and fostering beneficial consolidations and efficiencies planned for the future

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida by consolidating Navy Region Gulf Coast, with Navy Region Southeast at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida. Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas by consolidating Navy Region South with Navy Region Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, Illinois and Navy Region Southeast at Naval Station Jacksonville, Florida. (Refer to page H-9 of the DON Report).

- Reduces the number of Installation Management regions from twelve to eight, streamlining the regional management structure and allowing for opportunities to collocate other regional entities to further align management concepts and efficiencies
- Sufficient Installation Management capability resides within the remaining regions
- Navy Reserve Forces Command installation management function and Navy Region Northeast are also consolidated into the remaining regions as part of the closures of Naval Support Activity New Orleans, Louisiana and Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut
- Supports the Department of the Navy establishment of Commander, Navy Installations in order to align shore assets in support of Navy requirements
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $3.21 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $34.55 million

Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South leased space in Charleston, South Carolina. Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Charleston with Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Southeast, Jacksonville, Florida at Naval Air Station Jacksonville; Naval Facilities Midwest, Great Lakes, Illinois at Naval Station Great Lakes; and Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia at Naval Station Norfolk. Close Naval Facilities Engineering Filed Activity Northeast leased space in Lester, Pennsylvania. Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania with Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk at Naval Station Norfolk and relocate Navy Crane Center Lester, Pennsylvania to Norfolk Nava Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia. (Refer to page H-11 of the DON Report).

- Enhances the Navy's long-standing initiative to accomplish common management and support on a regionalized basis by consolidating and collocating Naval Facilities commands with the installation management Regions in Jacksonville, Great Lakes and Norfolk
- Collocation aligns management concepts and efficiencies and may allow for further consolidation in the future
- Achieves savings by moving from leased space to government-owned space
- Increases average military value for the remaining Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division / Engineering Field Activity activities
- Relocates the Navy Crane Center to a site with functional synergy
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $37.85 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $81.81 million

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, Texas by consolidating Navy Reserve Readiness Command South with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, Illinois. Realign Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island and the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC by consolidating Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic and relocating the consolidated commands to Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia. (Refer to page H-13 of the DON Report).

- Enhances Navy's long-standing initiative to accomplish common management and support on a regionalized basis, by consolidating and collocating reserve readiness commands with the installation management Regions
- Aligns management concepts and efficiencies and ensures a reserve voice at each region as well as enabling future savings through consolidation of like functions
- Increases average military value for the remaining Naval Reserve Readiness Commands and ensures that each of the installation management Regions has an organization to manage reserve matters within the region
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $2.56 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $91.69 million

Other Support

Realign Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island by relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia. (Refer to page I-9 of the DON Report).

- Navy Warfare Development Command performs the functions of warfare innovation, concept development, fleet and joint experimentation, and the synchronization and dissemination of doctrine
- Relocation to Norfolk better aligns the Navy's warfare development organization with those of the other joint force components and Joint Forces Command, as well as places it in better proximity to Fleet Forces Command and the Second Fleet Battle Lab it supports
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $11.75 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $2.06 million

Fenceline Closures

The Joint Cross-Service recommendations impacted numerous Department of the Navy activities and installations. In some instances, the Joint Cross-Service recommendation resulted in a realignment of the Department of the Navy installation. In other cases, the recommendation or series of recommendations removed the primary missions / functions and the majority of personnel from the installation allowing for closure of the installation fenceline, thereby generating additional savings and reductions in excess capacity. The Department of the Navy evaluated a number of fenceline closures that led to recommendations.

Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, California. Disestablish the depot maintenance of Aircraft Other Components, Aircraft Rotary, and Strategic Missiles. Consolidate depot maintenance of Engines / Transmissions, Alabama. Consolidate the depot maintenance of Conventional Weapons, Engines / Transmissions, Material Handling, Powertrain Components, Starters / Alternators / Generators, Test Measurement Diagnostic Equipment, and Wire at Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, Georgia. Consolidate depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Electro-Optics / Night Vision / Forward-Looking-Infrared, Generators, Ground Support Equipment, Radar, and Radio at Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania. Consolidate depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles at Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania. Realign Fleet Support Division Maintenance Center Barstow and Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow operations to increase efficiencies and reduce infrastructure. Refer to page J-3 of the DON Report).

- Full closure was evaluated but disapproved in order to maintain a west coast depot maintenance presence at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow to provide west coast operating forces with a close, responsive source for depot maintenance support
- Required capacity to support workloads and core requirements for the DoD is relocated to other DoD Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence, thereby increasing the military value of depot maintenance performed at these sites

- Results in utilization of DoD capacity to facilitate performance of interservice workload
- Optimizes the depot maintenance operations at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $26.02 million with NPS savings to the Department over 20 years of $230.61 million

Close Naval Support Activity Corona, California. Relocate Naval Surface Warfare Division Corona to Naval Base Ventura County (Naval Air Station Point Mugu), California. (Refer to page J-5 of the DON Report).

- Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona performs three required missions for Department of the Navy (Independent Assessment Capability, Metrology and Calibration Laboratories, and Tactical Aircrew Combat Training System Ranges)
- Relocation of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona to Naval Air Station Point Mugu collocates it with other Research, Development and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation activities and with fleet assets at Naval Air Station Point Mugu
- Provides a more efficient organization with greater synergies and increased effectiveness. Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $70.18 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $0.36 million

Close the naval installation at Athens, Georgia. Relocate the Navy Supply Corps School and the Center for Service Support to Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island. (Refer to page J-7 of the DON Report).

- Closes a single-function installation and relocates its activities to a multi-function installation with higher military value
- Naval Station Newport has the capacity to support the Navy Supply Corps School training mission with existing infrastructure, making relocation of Navy Supply Corps School to Naval Station Newport desirable and cost efficient
- Supports Department of the Navy initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport
- Center for Service Support is relocated to Naval Station Newport with the Naval Supply Corps School to capitalize on existing resource and personnel efficiencies
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $23.79 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $21.80 million

Close Naval Support Activity New Orleans, Louisiana. Relocate the Navy Reserve Personnel Command and the Enlisted Placement and Management Center to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, Tennessee and consolidate with the Naval Personnel Command. Relocate the Naval Reserve Recruiting Command to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington and consolidate with the Navy Recruiting Command. Relocate the Navy Reserve Command to Naval Support Activity Norfolk, Virginia. Relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, Louisiana and consolidate with Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of

Mobilization Command, which is relocating from Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, Missouri. (Refer to page J-9 of the DON Report).

- Collocation of the Navy Reserve Personnel Command, the Enlisted Placement Management Center, and the Naval Reserve Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington creates a Navy Human Resources Center of Excellence, improves personnel life-cycle management, and furthers active and reserve component total force integration and effectiveness
- Consolidates Reserve personnel and recruiting headquarters with like active component functions in a single location and eliminates stand-alone headquarters
- Relocation of the Navy Reserve Command to Naval Support Activity, Norfolk with its active component headquarters will enhance internal active and reserve component interoperability, significantly increase interaction between the two components, and produce a reduction in force size by eliminating duplicative staff
- Relocation of Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Louisiana maintains a central location for management of widely-dispersed Marine Corps reserve elements and allows consolidation of Marine reserve management functions
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $164.59 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $276.42 million

Close the Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, Maine. Relocate the ship depot repair function to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, Virginia; Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, Washington. Relocate the Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement Command to Naval Shipyard Norfolk. (Refer to page J-13 of the DON Report).

- Retains one nuclear-capable shipyard on each coast, plus sufficient shipyard capacity to support forward deployed assets
- There are four Naval Shipyards performing depot-level ship refueling, modernization, overhaul and repair work and there is sufficient excess capacity in the aggregate across the four shipyards to close either Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor or Naval Shipyard Portsmouth
- There is insufficient excess capacity to close any other shipyard or combination of shipyards
- Naval Shipyard Portsmouth was selected for closure, rather than Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor, because it is the only closure that could both eliminate excess capacity and satisfy retention of strategically placed shipyard capability
- Planned force structure and force positioning adjustments reflected in the 20-year Force Structure Plan led to the selection of Naval Shipyard Portsmouth as the preferred closure candidate between the two sites
- Naval Shipyard Portsmouth had a low military value compared to operational homeports and, its berthing capacity is not required to support the Force Structure Plan
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $448.43 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $1.26 billion

Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, Missouri. Relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, Louisiana and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. Retain an enclave for the 9th Marine Corps District and the 24th Marine Corps Regiment. (Refer to page J-15 of the DON Report).

- Relocation of Marine Corps Reserve Support Command and its parent command, Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans maintains a central location for management of widely dispersed Marine Corps Reserve elements and allows consolidation of Marine Reserve Management functions
- Consolidation with its headquarters will significantly increase interaction and operational efficiency as well as eliminate duplicative staff
- Location of this consolidated headquarters at a joint reserve base will enhance joint service interoperability concepts
- Total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $23.28 million with NPV savings to the Department over 20 years of $49.83 million

Joint Cross-Service Group Contributions

A primary objective of BRAC 2005 was to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity. In this regard, BRAC 2005 is strategic. It is the next step in implementation of the principles set forth by Congress in the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

The inclusion of the joint cross-service process in the BRAC 2005 evaluations allowed the Department of the Navy to explore numerous innovative and transformational alternatives to current configurations of business lines and locations.

Joint Cross-Service Groups analyzed common business-oriented functions and evaluated them for ways to consolidate and eliminate excess infrastructure. We support their recommended actions and look forward to realizing the benefits they will provide to the Department of the Navy.

The recommendations developed by the Joint Cross-Service Groups benefit the Department of the Navy in the following ways:

Headquarters and support activities

- Develop joint enterprise-wide solutions for civilian personnel, correctional facilities, mobilization, investigative / adjudication and media activities, and establish joint basing arrangements affecting ten naval installations
- Virtually eliminate all Department of the Navy requirements for leased space near the Pentagon, thereby enhancing anti-terrorism / force protection posture and reducing leased space costs
- Relocate Navy and Marine Corps Reserve, personnel, recruiting, and training commands to optimize organizational alignment and location

Industrial activities

- Recommendations yield a smaller industrial base that is appropriately sized and positioned, flexible and multi-functional
- Complete ship maintenance consolidation in Fleet concentration areas
- Initiate aviation intermediate and depot maintenance consolidation into Aviation Fleet Readiness Centers

Education and training activities

- Recommendations create several joint schools
- Establish a joint initial training site for the Joint Strike Fighter
- Better align Service training functions, increase joint training
- Reduce infrastructure costs

Medical activities

- Recommendations leverage civilian opportunities by privatizing inpatient service facilities
- Optimize regional healthcare and joint healthcare options
- Consolidate enlisted medical education
- Create integrated full-spectrum research centers of excellence

Technical activities

- Recommendations build upon prior BRAC rounds to create integrated full-spectrum centers of excellence in functional areas
- Collapse major platform domains into integrated research, development, acquisition, test and evaluation centers for air, ground, sea, and space domains
- Eliminate redundancy

Supply and Storage activities

- Transition traditional military logistics linear processes to a networked, force-focused construct, which minimizes the number of sites and reduces excess capacity
- Provides for increased jointness, enhanced supply chain efficiency and leveraged DoD buying power

Conclusion

Recommendations support Total Force operational flexibility and readiness sustainability.

Taken in conjunction with the substantial closures and realignments in prior rounds of BRAC, these recommendations:

- Align the infrastructure of the Department of the Navy with the forces it must support
- Identify savings that can be used for recapitalization and force structure investments